

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 7-8 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claim 7 has been amended. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment. Entry of this Amendment before examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 7-8 would still be pending.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112:**

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the term “second prism”, as employed, is contrary to its ordinary meaning. The Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

The Examiner provides one exemplary definition of a prism, as follows:

In Optics: a transparent solid body, *often having triangular bases*, used for dispersing light into a spectrum or for reflecting rays of light. See Office Action, p. 3 (emphasis added).

This exemplary definition makes clear that a prism, while “often” having triangular bases, is not limited to having triangular bases. As such, the Applicants’ use of the term “second prism” to encompass at least the exemplary second prism 90 of Fig. 4 is well within the ordinary meaning (as provided by the Examiner) of the term, e.g., a transparent solid body used for dispersing light into a spectrum or for reflecting rays of light. This is further support by way of example by the exemplary definition(s) for the term “prism” provided by the online dictionary “Webster online search” (URL: <http://www.m-w.com/>).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103:**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mocker et al. (US 5,325,175). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mocker et al. in view of Kato et al. (US 6,618,177).

Claim 7 as amended is directed to an arrangement in which the third surface is arranged non-perpendicularly to an optical axis of the first light beam extending from the light source to the beam-splitting member, is arranged so as to intersect with an extended line of the optical axis of the first light beam extending from the light source to the beam-splitting member, and is arranged such that the third surface forms an angle of 90° with respect to both the first surface and the second surface of the second prism.

For example, the third surface is arranged so as to intersect with an extended line (dotted line in figure 4) of the optical axis (51) of the first light beam extending from the light source (1) to the beam-splitting member (12). In a case where the second prism has the third surface described above, the light emitted from the light source leaks through the beam-splitting member and reaches the third surface. In this case, crosstalk may be caused. (See e.g., specification, paras. [0031] and [0032]).

On the contrary, Mocker (U.S. Patent No. 5,325,175) does not teach or suggest the third surface as recited in claim 7. That is, the block 14 of Mocker does not have a surface corresponding to the third surface of the arrangement of claim 7. In addition, the structure of Mocker does not have the above-noted problem which may be caused in the structure of the claimed arrangement.

Kato (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,177) does not remedy the deficiencies in the teachings of Mocker.

Accordingly, claims 7 and 8 are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5363.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-5363.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 25, 2007

By: 

James Hwa  
Registration No. 42,680  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101